



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

HC

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/532,396	03/22/2000	Youmin Wang	6207.N CN1	8049
7590	12/28/2004		EXAMINER	
SIDNEY B. WILLIAMS, JR. FLYNN, DTHEIL, BOUDTELL & TANIS, P.C. 2026 RAMBLING ROAD KALAMAZOO, MI 49008-1699			HUI, SAN MING R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/532,396	WANG ET AL.
	Examiner San-ming Hui	Art Unit 1617

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

- (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See attached.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See attached.

6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 22 and 23.

Claim(s) objected to: None.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-21 and 24-26.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

8. The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. Other: _____

San-ming Hui
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1617

ADVISORY ACTION

Continuation of 2)

Applicant's amendments filed October 28, 2004 deleting the limitation that exclude salt of citric acid raises new consideration for the examiner. Examiner notes that the prosecution is closed. Therefore, the deletion of such limitation will force the examiner to issue a similar rejection under 35 USC 103(a) as the one set forth in the office action mailed January 28, 2003 and reopen the case. Therefore, the amendments will not be entered.

Continuation of 5)

Applicant's arguments filed October 28, 2004 with regard to the negative limitation recited in the claims have been considered, but are not found persuasive. As discussed in the previous office action mailed June 23, 2004, any negative limitation or exclusionary proviso must have basis in the original disclosure. If alternative elements are positively recited in the specification, they may be explicitly excluded in the claims. [emphasis added] See *In re Johnson*, 558 F.2d 1008, 1019, 194 USPQ 187, 196 (CCPA 1977). See also MPEP 2163 and 2173.05(i). In the instant case, the instant specification fails to disclose the composition comprising the herein claimed actives and citric acid or the amino acid excluded. Examiner notes that essentially the instant specification discloses genus of compounds without disclosing the specific species. Therefore, to exclude one or two specific species from the genus would be improper because the instant specification only have support for the genus, not the genus minus

a certain numbers of species. Therefore, the claims are properly rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

In response to Applicant's arguments filed October 28, 2004 citing *In re Edwards*, 196 USPQ 465, 469 (CCPA 1978) that the subject matter does not need to be described literally, Examiner notes that the instant case is distinguished from *Edwards*. In *Edwards*, certain specific polyols reactants are actually disclosed, so that one of ordinary skill in the art would have known what the recited polyols would be by reading the specifications. In the instant case, citric acid and the amino acids excluded from the specification are not disclosed or even mentioned. Therefore, by just reading the instant specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would not know to exclude citric acid and the specific amino acids. Therefore, the claims are properly rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to San-ming Hui whose telephone number is (571) 272-0626. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon 9:00 to 1:00, Tu - Fri from 9:00 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, PhD., can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



San-ming Hui
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1617